



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,988	08/29/2003	Brian James DeHamer	200208087-1	2983

7590 07/09/2008  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 50527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

VO, TED T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/09/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/652,988  
Filing Date: August 29, 2003  
Appellant(s): DEHAMER ET AL.

---

Michael G. Fletcher  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 03/31/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 07/02/2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows:

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "WebSplitter: A Unified XML Framework for Multi-Device Collaborative Web Browsing", ACM, 2000, to Han et al., (hereinafter "the Han reference").

**WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS**

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph to claim 18-20 are withdrawn.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph to claims 18-20 are withdrawn.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C 101 to claims 18-20 are withdrawn.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

Han et al., "WebSplitter: A Unified XML Framework for Multi-Device Collaborative Web Browsing", ACM (December 2000), pp. 221-230.

### **(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Han et al., “WebSplitter: A Unified XML Framework for Multi-Device Collaborative Web Browsing”, ACM, 2000 (hereinafter: Han).

- As in the Appellants' brief (page 15: the last line), Appellants' argument of the independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 18 is as a group. Claim 18 is broadly recited and it presents the argument feature. Claim 18 will lead the claims and it is presented. Appellants addressed appealing to all claim 1-20; however, they did not argued all other claims. Therefore, the patentable determination of the claims would stand or fall together with claim 18.

Claim 18 is controlled as in the appealed issue:

As per Claim 18: Han discloses a PROXY that performs a navigation to forward a user' intended destination based on the user request during a session login.

See p. 226, sec. 3.1:

Figure 5 summarizes the steps involved in establishing a multi-device collaborative browsing session in aWebSplitter proxy. The proxy registers itself (1) to the service discovery database so that a client can find the proxy (2). Next, the session creator clicks on the desired proxy's hyperlink (3) and the proxy returns a session login menu requesting the session name and URL of the first XML Web page (4) (examiner note: *user's intended destination/ save's user intended destination*). Then, the proxy pulls the requested XML page (5) and its associated policy file (6) into the proxy. The proxy parses the XML page and policy file to create privilege groups (7), then sends to the session creator a login menu requesting username and password (8). After matching the session creator to a privilege group (examiner note: *the prerequisite*), the proxy announces the new session to service discovery and requests any devices registered by the session creator (9). Finally, the portion of the requested XML page that the session creator is permitted to receive is

Art Unit: 2100

returned to the session creator (10) (examiner note: *subsequently recall that information to redirect the user back to the intended destination upon completion of the prerequisite*).

Regarding claimed limitation, *A tangible machine readable medium, comprising:*

*code* (e.g. See Figure 5, XML, Policy file (7): code) *that is adapted to save a user's intended destination* (i.e. “the session name and URL of the first XML Web page (4)”. In Figure 1: this URL from Web server; in Figure 5, from “Service Discovery DB” such as Econ 101: *to save a user's intended destination*) *and subsequently recall that information to redirect the user back to the intended destination upon completion of the prerequisite* (Sec 3.1: “..then sends to the session creator a login menu requesting username and password (8)” and “After matching the session creator to a privilege group”: *the prerequisite*, and, “Finally, the portion of the requested XML page that the session creator is permitted to receive is returned to the session creator (10)”: *subsequently recall that information to redirect the user back to the intended destination upon completion of the prerequisite*). And also see p. 227, sec. 3.3.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

- a. Appellants traversed the rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph: This ground of rejection is withdrawn.
- b. Appellants traversed the rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph: This ground of rejection is withdrawn.
- c. Appellants traversed the rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 101: This ground of rejection is withdrawn.

d. Appellants traversed the rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Han et al: (Described by Appellants as Fourth Ground of Rejection).

Appellants' argument:

As noted by Appellants, Claims 1, 8, 15, and 18 are argued as in the same group.

Appellants argued that Han fails to disclose an architecture in which a user's intended destination is saved (the claimed limitation in claim 18 is: "***save a user's intended destination and subsequently recall that information to redirect the user back to the intended destination upon completion of the prerequisite***"). Appellants contend that Han's teaching is a single application for creating of various views of the same document (Brief: p.19) and Han disclosed only one intended destination by the user, namely, partial view corresponding to specific prerequisite completion, where appellant reasoned that because the user's partial view destination corresponding to the login that was entered, there is no need to save the user intended destination for redirection to another.

Examiner's response:

Examiner strongly disagrees: Han's teaching reads on what the claim is recited.

Han discloses a server, a proxy, and a plurality of computers connected to the server via Proxy, where web presentations are stored as URLs in the server. Each computer includes a browser. There are computers from Session presenter/lecturer and from Students. Figure 5, a browser of a Session creator (or Lecturer) includes a session login menu and a user login menu (described in sec. 3.3, p. 227). In the session login menu, it includes requesting a session name and URL (i.e. *user's intended destination*).

See p. 226, sec. 3.1:

Figure 5 summarizes the steps involved in establishing a multi-device collaborative browsing session in aWebSplitter proxy. The proxy registers itself (1) to the service discovery database so that a client can find the proxy (2). Next, the session creator clicks on the desired proxy's hyperlink (3) and the proxy returns a session login menu requesting the session name and URL of the first XML Web page (4) (*user's intended destination/ save's user intended destination*). Then, the proxy pulls the requested XML page (5) and its associated policy file (6) into the proxy. The proxy parses the XML page and policy file to create privilege groups (7), then sends to the session creator a login menu requesting username and password (8) (*upon completion of the prerequisite*). After matching the session creator to a privilege group (*the prerequisite*), the proxy announces the new session to service discovery and requests any devices registered by the session creator (9). Finally, the portion of the requested XML page that the session creator is permitted to receive is returned to the session creator (10) (*subsequently recall that information to redirect the user back to the intended destination upon completion of the prerequisite*).

The italics within the parentheses are the claimed limitations mapped to the steps in Figure 5, p. 226, which are processed by the lecturer or session creator. It is also noted that Figure 6 presents the joint session of the Students, named as User x, User y.

When a session creator selects a URL, a *user intended destination*, such as Econ 101 shown in Figure 5 in a login session menu (i.e. a session login menu: step 4), the URL does not come up right away, but the proxy processes user login menu of step (8) (i.e. a user login menu). In step (8), it requests user name and password (see in sec. 3.1, p. 226). Clearly, the URL that links to Econ 101 is saved in the process during the time of user login menu which is requesting for user name and password.

Therefore, if it is without a save, the requested portion of the URL (i.e. the XML or HTML (10)) cannot be retuned in the browser of the session creator. Clearly, after the password is already checked, the session creator is already login; he can redirect Econ 101, as a web



Art Unit: 2100

presentation, anytime without being checked for username and password again (*upon completion of the prerequisite*).

Appellants' argument alleged that Han fails to disclose the above limitation (claim 18). Appellants contended that Han discloses only one intended destination by the user, namely, partial view corresponding to specific prerequisite completion. It should be noted that claim 18 recites only "user's indented destination". The Appellants' argument appears is referring to other functions in the Han's teaching, or referring to the user who is User X or User Y (i.e. the students' browser (Figure 6) who has only a user login menu (described in sec. 3.3, p. 227)). Therefore, when argued, "*Since the user's intended destination is partial view corresponding to the login (prerequisite) that was entered, there is no need to save the user's intended destination for redirection to another*" (emphasis added), it is corresponding to the user login menu that was entered by only the user like the User X or User Y for having a partial view, where this user does not have session login menu (such as the section Econ 101 in Figure 5) for selecting a user's intended destination.

Since, the Appellants' claimed recitation is broad; it is clearly interpretable by the proxy performed by the navigation in the session creator's browser.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ted T. Vo/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2191

Conferees:

Wei Zhen

/Wei Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191

Eddie Lee

/Eddie C Lee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, TC 2100